

REMARKS

After entry of this Amendment, the pending claims are claims 1,3-64 and 65-70. The Office Action dated January 31, 2008 has been carefully considered. Claims 1, 9,17, 27, 28, 35, 42 and 62 have been amended. Claim 2 has been cancelled. Support for the amendments to claims 1, 9, 17, 27, 28, 35, 45 and 62 are found in the specification as originally filed, as well as in the figures as originally filed. No new matter has been added. The Examiner's determination that claims 22-25, 36-39, 49-53, and 67-69 contain allowable subject matter is noted with appreciation. Reconsideration and allowance of the present application in view of the above Amendment and following Remarks is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action dated January 31, 2008, the Examiner:

- Objected to claims 27-28 and 54 for failing to identify antecedent basis for the limitations "the first processing means", "the first database", "the second processing means", and "the internet";
- Rejected claims 1-10, 12-21, 31, 35, 40-47, 58-66 and 70 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Maloney (US 2004/0021570);
- Rejected claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maloney in view of Meyer et al. (U.S. 6, 575,300);
- Rejected claims 26-30, 48 and 55-57 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maloney in view of Freeman;
- Rejected claim 54 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maloney in view of Freeman (US 2001/0049629)

Objected claims 27-28 and 54

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to claims 27 and 28 as failing to identify proper antecedent basis for the cited limitation. Claims 27 and 28 have been amended to include the proper antecedent basis. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the objections to claims 27 and 28.

Claim 54 has been amended to properly refer to the "Internet." "Internet" is the term commonly used to describe a network of computers, therefore the scope of the claim would be reasonably ascertainable by those skilled in the art. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the objection to claim 54.

Rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Independent claim 1

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Published Application 2004/0021570 to Maloney. According to the Examiner, Maloney discloses all of the claimed elements of claim 1. Maloney is directed to a mobile object tracking system for tracking the use of individual objects in a group of objects removed from a location until the replacement of the objects removed. Maloney ¶ 11. According to the Examiner, Maloney discloses a container, Maloney Fig. 2 and ¶ 40, to receive the monetary objects, Maloney ¶ 3 and an RFID device to be packaged within the container so as to be removable from the container when opened for re-use in another said container, Maloney ¶ 55. However, Applicants respectfully submit that Maloney does not teach every limitation of independent claim 1 as amended.

By way of background, the invention is directed to an improved packaging system for sheet objects such as banknotes in which the risk of pilfering is materially reduced. Pilfering is a significant problem associated with the packaging and transport of banknotes, for example from a supermarket checkout to an accounting office. Reusable, secure cassettes have been used, which utilizes a cassette in a form of a metal box that receives validated banknotes from a note acceptor, e.g. at a supermarket checkout station. When full of banknotes, the lid of the box is securely closed and the cassette is transported to an accounting office where it is opened under secure conditions and the

cash is removed from the box. However, with such a re-usable container, or cassette, there is a risk of pilfering- operatives may remove a small number of banknotes from the stack in the container. This can be very difficult to detect as there is no immediate visible sign that pilfering has occurred. Since conventional containers are used multiple times, the fraud may be repeated many times, so that while the monetary value of the notes pilfered during each pilfering event may be small and hard to detect, the amount in total may be unacceptably large as a result of the repeated pilfering.

The packaging according to amended claim 1, takes an alternative approach and utilizes a one-time use seal for the banknotes. Therefore, if the container is opened during transport, it is readily apparent that pilfering has occurred. Amended claim 1 is directed to a packaging for a stack of monetary objects, comprising a container to receive the monetary objects, a reusable RFID device disposable within the container and a non-reusable closure member for providing a one time seal to confine the monetary objects and the RFID device within the container. The monetary objects and the RFID device remain inaccessible after the closure member is heat sealed to the container unless the closure member becomes broken or the container is tampered with. To gain access to the contents of the container, the closure member must be broken and cannot be reused to seal the container. Amended claim 1 also includes a reusable RFID device, which may store details of the banknotes in the container confined by the tamper-evident closure member. The RFID is itself packaged within the container, so as to prevent the RFID device being physically tampered with. Thus, according to the invention, the tamper-evident closure member provides protection for the RFID device. Although the closure member cannot be re-used once broken to gain access to objects within the container, the

RFID device is removable and can be reused in another container.

In contrast, Maloney discloses a reusable system for storing and tracking the removal of specific objects checked. Maloney Abstract. Because the purpose of the system is to track the check-out and return of certain objects, Maloney's system includes a storage unit 12 with a door or a similar closure member hingedly attached to the side of the storage unit so that the storage unit can be reclosed after it has been opened. Maloney ¶ 40. The storage unit provides housing for objects not checked out for use, Maloney ¶ 12, and the hingedly attached door is movable between an open position and a closed position, as objects are removed from or returned to the storage cabinet. This contrasts with the one-time seal provided by the tamper-evident closure member of the present invention, which once "opened" cannot be reused to "close" the container again.

Moreover, although the Examiner points to ¶ 55 and ¶ 59 of Maloney specification in support of the RFID device limitation, nothing in Maloney discloses the inclusion of an RFID device. ¶ 55 describes the use of security ID straps having bar codes that can be scanned into the system using a bar code scanning wand. New security ID straps are applied and scanned into the system when the objects checked out are returned. The ID straps do not correspond to the RFID device claimed for in this application. The RFID device in the present invention is configured for re-use in another container whereas in Maloney, the ID tag is designed to be broken when the object is removed so that it is not suitable for re-use. Thus, an RFID tag when used according to Maloney would not be suitable for re-use in another container.

It is therefore respectfully submitted that Maloney, which discloses a tracking system, having a cabinet for repeated opening and closing and utilizing security ID straps

does not teach a packaging for a stack of monetary objects, comprising a container to receive the monetary objects, a reusable RFID device and a non-reusable closure member for providing a one-time seal to confine the monetary objects and the RFID device within the container. Rather Maloney is directed to a reusable tracking system with a storage unit made of high strength material to ensure security and durability that receives and stores objects when those objects are not checked out. Unlike the non-reusable closure member of the packaging system claimed, the closure member described in Maloney is hingedly attached to the storage unit and can be moved repeatedly between an open position and a closed position. Applicants' packaging includes a closure member that is not hingedly attached to the container nor capable of altering between open and close positions. In fact, once the closure member "closes" the container by being heat sealed to the container, the only way to open the container is by breaking the closure member. Therefore, the only way to gain access to the contents of the container is either by breaking the closure member or by tampering with the container.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Maloney does not teach a packaging for a stack of monetary objects, comprising a container to receive the monetary objects, a reusable RFID device disposable in the container and a temper-evident closure member for providing a one-time seal to confine the monetary objects and the RFID device within the container. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of amended claim 1 based on Maloney be withdrawn.

Moreover, as claims 3-8 all depend from amended claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that these claims are equally allowable. Withdrawal of these rejections and allowance of claims 3-8 are also respectfully requested.

Independent claim 9

The Examiner also rejected amended claim 9. For at least the above-identified reasons, it is respectfully submitted that Maloney does not anticipate amended claim 9 because Maloney does not teach a method of processing monetary objects comprising: packaging the monetary objects by stacking them in a container, providing a reusable RFID device disposable within the container and sealing the container with a non-reusable temper-evident closure member after the container becomes full to confine the monetary objects and the RFID.

Maloney is directed to a tracking system, having a cabinet for repeated opening and closing and utilizing security ID straps. Maloney does not teach a method of processing monetary objects comprising: packaging the monetary objects by stacking them in a container, providing a reusable RFID device disposable within the container and sealing the container with a non-reusable temper-evident closure member after the container becomes full to confine the monetary objects and the RFID. Unlike the non-reusable closure member of the method claimed, the closure member described in Maloney is hingedly attached to the storage unit and can be moved repeatedly between an open position and a closed position. Applicants' method includes a closure member that is not hingedly attached to the container nor capable of altering between open and close positions. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of amended claim 9 based on Maloney be withdrawn.

Moreover, as claims 10-16 and 43 all directly or indirectly depend from amended claim 9, Applicants respectfully submit that these claims are equally allowable. Withdrawal of these rejections and allowance of claims 10-16 and 43 are also respectfully requested.

Independent claim 17

The Examiner also rejected independent claim 17. For at least the above-identified reasons, it is respectfully submitted that Maloney does not anticipate amended claim 17 because Maloney does not teach a packaging system for packaging a stack of sheet objects that have an attributable monetary value in a container, comprising (i) a packaging device, comprising: means for determining first value data relating to a sheet object to be stacked in the container; and an RF reader/writer for writing said first value data to a reusable RFID device, (ii) at least one container configured to be filled with a stack of sheet objects by the packaging device and (iii) a reusable RFID device disposable within the container and (iv) a non-reusable closure member for providing a one-time seal for the container to confine the stack of sheet objects and the RFID device.

Maloney is directed to a tracking system, having a cabinet for repeated opening and closing and utilizing security ID straps. Maloney does not teach a packaging system for packaging a stack of sheet objects that have an attributable monetary value in a container, comprising (i) a packaging device, comprising: means for determining first value data relating to a sheet object to be stacked in the container; and an RF reader/writer for writing said first value data to a reusable RFID device, (ii) at least one container configured to be filled with a stack of sheet objects by the packaging device and (iii) a reusable RFID device disposable within the container and (iv) a non-reusable closure member for providing a one-time seal for the container to confine the stack of sheet objects and the RFID device. Unlike the non-reusable closure member of the packaging system claimed, the closure member described in Maloney is hingedly attached to the storage unit and can be moved repeatedly between an open position and a closed position. Applicants' packaging system includes a closure member that is not

hingedly attached to the container nor capable of altering between open and close positions. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of amended claim 17 based on Maloney be withdrawn.

Moreover, as claims 18-21 and 26-34 all directly or indirectly depend from amended claim 17, Applicants respectfully submit that these claims are equally allowable. Withdrawal of these rejections and allowance of claims 18-21 and 26-34 are also respectfully requested.

Independent claim 35

The Examiner also rejected amended claim 35. For at least the above-identified reasons, it is respectfully submitted that Maloney does not anticipate amended claim 35 because Maloney does not teach a method of transporting sheet objects that have an attributable monetary value, the method comprising: determining first value data relating to a stack of sheet objects packaged in a container; writing said first value data to an RFID device associated with the container; and sealing the container with a non-reusable closure member to confine the stack of sheet objects packed in the container and the RFID device.

Maloney is directed to a tracking system, having a cabinet for repeated opening and closing and utilizing security ID straps. Maloney does not teach a method of transporting sheet objects that have an attributable monetary value, the method comprising: determining first value data relating to a stack of sheet objects packaged in a container; writing said first value data to an RFID device associated with the container; and sealing the container with a non-reusable closure member to confine the stack of sheet objects packed in the container and the RFID device. Unlike the non-reusable closure member of the method claimed, the closure member described in Maloney is

hingedly attached to the storage unit and can be moved repeatedly between an open position and a closed position. Applicants' method includes a closure member that is not hingedly attached to the container nor capable of altering between open and close positions. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of amended claim 35 based on Maloney be withdrawn.

Moreover, as claims 40-42, 44 and 54 all directly or indirectly depend from amended claim 35, Applicants respectfully submit that these claims are equally allowable. Withdrawal of these rejections and allowance of claims 40-42, 44 and 54 are also respectfully requested.

Independent claim 45

The Examiner also rejected amended claim 45. For at least the above-identified reasons, it is respectfully submitted that Maloney does not anticipate amended claim 45 because Maloney does not teach a system for packaging a stack of sheet objects that have an attributable monetary value in a container, comprising (i) a packaging device, comprising: means for determining first value data relating to a sheet object to be stacked in the container; and an RF reader for reading identification information from an RFID device associated with a container, (ii) at least one container configured to be filled with a stack of sheet objects by the packaging device, (iii) a reusable RFID device disposable in the container and (iv) at least one non-reusable closure member for providing a one-time seal to confine the stack of sheet objects and the RFID device, and (v) first processing means having a first database for storing identification information read from the RFID device in association with said first value data.

Maloney is directed to a tracking system, having a cabinet for repeated opening and closing and utilizing security ID straps. Maloney does not teach a system for

packaging comprising a reusable RFID device and a non-reusable closure member for providing a one-time seal to confine the monetary objects and the RFID device within the container. Unlike the non-reusable closure member of the method claimed, the closure member described in Maloney is hingedly attached to the storage unit and can be moved repeatedly between an open position and a closed position. Applicants' system includes a closure member that is not hingedly attached to the container nor capable of altering between open and close positions. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of amended claim 45 based on Maloney be withdrawn.

Moreover, as claims 46-48 and 55-61 all directly or indirectly depend from amended claim 45, Applicants respectfully submit that these claims are equally allowable. Withdrawal of these rejections and allowance of claims 46-48 and 55-61 are also respectfully requested.

Independent claim 62

The Examiner also rejected amended claim 62. For at least the above-identified reasons, it is respectfully submitted that Maloney does not anticipate amended claim 62 because Maloney does not teach a method of transporting sheet objects that have an attributable monetary value, the method comprising: determining first value data relating to a stack of sheet objects packaged in a container; reading identification information from a reusable RFID device associated with the container; storing said identification information in a first database in association with said first value data and sealing the RFID device inside the container with a non-reusable closure member to provide a one-time seal to confine the RFID and the sheet objects.

Maloney is directed to a tracking system, having a cabinet for repeated opening and closing and utilizing security ID straps. Maloney does not teach a method of

transporting sheet objects that have an attributable monetary value, the method comprising: determining first value data relating to a stack of sheet objects packaged in a container; reading identification information from a reusable RFID device associated with the container; storing said identification information in a first database in association with said first value data and sealing the RFID device inside the container with a non-reusable closure member to provide a one-time seal to confine the RFID and the sheet objects. Unlike the non-reusable closure member of the method claimed, the closure member described in Maloney is hingedly attached to the storage unit and can be moved repeatedly between an open position and a closed position. Applicants' method includes a closure member that is not hingedly attached to the container nor capable of altering between open and close positions. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of amended claim 62 based on Maloney be withdrawn.

Moreover, as claims 63-64, 66 and 70 all directly or indirectly depend from amended claim 62, Applicants respectfully submit that these claims are equally allowable. Withdrawal of these rejections and allowance of claims 63-64, 66 and 70 are also respectfully requested.

Rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Dependent claim 11

As discussed above, Maloney fails to teach a non-reusable closure member and the use of a RFID device that can be reusable. It is further submitted that claim 11 is patentable over Maloney in view of Meyer because neither Maloney nor Meyer disclose, teach or suggest a method of processing monetary objects comprising: packaging the monetary objects by stacking them in a container, providing a reusable RFID device disposable within the container and sealing the container with a non-reusable temper-

evident closure member after the container becomes full to confine the monetary objects and the RFID. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Maloney in view of Meyer does not disclose, teach, or suggest all of the limitations of dependent claim 11. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that dependent claim 11 is allowable over the cited prior art. Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of dependent claim 11 are also respectfully requested.

Rejected claim 26-30, 48, 55-57 and 54

As discussed above, Maloney fails to teach a non-reusable closure member and the use of a RFID device that can be reusable. It is respectfully submitted that Freeman does not overcome the shortcomings of Maloney. Although Freeman describes using radio frequency to identify and locate a package, it is not directed to a packaging system with a non-reusable closure member for confining the stack of sheet objects and the RFID. Therefore claims 26-30, 48, 55-57 and 54 are patentable over Maloney in view of Freeman because neither Maloney nor Freeman disclose, teach or suggest a packaging system for packaging a stack of sheet objects that have an attributable monetary value in a container, comprising (i) a packaging device, comprising: means for determining first value data relating to a sheet object to be stacked in the container; and an RF reader/writer for writing said first value data to a reusable RFID device, (ii) at least one container configured to be filled with a stack of sheet objects by the packaging device and (iii) a reusable RFID device disposable within the container and (iv) a non-reusable closure member for providing a one-time seal for the container to confine the stack of sheet objects and the RFID device.

Both Maloney and Freeman also do not disclose, teach or suggest all the limitations of independent claim 45 because they do not disclose, teach or suggest a

system for packaging a stack of sheet objects that have an attributable monetary value in a container, comprising (i) a packaging device, comprising: means for determining first value data relating to a sheet object to be stacked in the container; and an RF reader for reading identification information from an RFID device associated with a container, (ii) at least one container configured to be filled with a stack of sheet objects by the packaging device, (iii) a reusable RFID device disposable in the container and (iv) at least one non-reusable closure member for providing a one-time seal to confine the stack of sheet objects and the RFID device, and (v) first processing means having a first database for storing identification information read from the RFID device in association with said first value data.

Thus, it is respectfully submitted that dependent claims 26-30, 48, 54, 55-57 and 54 are allowable over the cited prior art. Withdrawal of these rejections and allowance of dependent claims 26-30, 48, 54, 55-57 and 54 are also respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims and allowance of this application.

The Commission is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required for this response, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 15-0665, Order No. 020305-004011.

Serial No. 10/580,759

Attorney Docket No.: 020305-004011

Respectfully submitted,
ORRICK, HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFFE LLP

Dated: June 30, 2008

By: /Rita H. Lin/
Rita H. Lin
Reg. No. 61,623

MAILING ADDRESS

ORRICK, HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFFE LLP
4 Park Plaza, Suite 1600
Irvine, CA 92614-2558
Tel. 949-567-6700
Fax: 949-567-6710